UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV19-00411-RGK (GJSx)	Date	April 3, 2019
Title	ROCIO MONARREZ v. WAL MART ASSOC., INC.		

Present: The Honorable

R. GARY KLAUSNER, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Sharon L. Williams

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Not Present

Not Present

Not Present

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order Remanding Action to State Court

On December 21, 2018, Rocio Monarrez ("Plaintiff") filed a complaint against Wal Mart Associates, Inc. ("Defendant") alleging state statutory claims based on disability discrimination in the workplace.

On January 18, 2019, Defendant removed the action to this Court alleging jurisdiction on the grounds of diversity of citizenship. Upon review of Defendant's Notice of Removal, the Court hereby remands the action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, district courts shall have original jurisdiction over any civil action in which the parties are citizens of different states and the action involved an amount in controversy that exceeds \$75,000. After a plaintiff files a case in state court, the defendant attempting to remove the case to federal court bears the burden of proving the amount in controversy requirement has been met. Lowdermilk v. United States Bank Nat'l Ass'n, 479 F.3d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 2007). If the complaint does not allege that the amount in controversy has been met, the removing defendant must plausibly allege in its notice of removal that the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional threshold. Dart Cherokee Basin Operating Co., LLC v. Owens, 135 S. Ct. 547, 553-54(2014). If the plaintiff contests, or the court questions, the defendant's allegation, the defendant must establish that the jurisdictional requirement has been met by a preponderance of the evidence. Guas v. Miles, Inc., 980 F.2d 564, 566–67 (9th Cir. 1992).

In her complaint, Plaintiff seeks damages for lost wages and benefits, emotional distress damages, punitive damages, and attorneys' fees. In support of its removal, Defendant calculates that based on Plaintiff's hourly rate, her back pay to date, is \$6,704.50. Defendant then states that including all other requested damages, the amount in controversy exceeds the jurisdictional minimum.

Defendant fails to prove that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. With \$6,704.50 as a starting point, and no supporting evidence regarding emotional distress damages, Defendants do not meet the minimum amount in controversy, as future lost wages, attorneys' fees and punitive damages

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

CIVIL WIINUIES - GENERAL		
CV19-00411-RGK (GJSx)	Date	April 3, 2019
ROCIO MONARREZ v. WAL MART ASSOC., INC.		
ive.		
mount in controversy, and some courts have declined to do so <i>Co of Reading, Pa.</i> , 2012 WL 2118239 at *5 (E.D. Cal. June found that attorneys' fees are in the control of the client and c years, depending on legal strategy. <i>See Grieff v. Brigandi Coi</i> June 11, 2014). The Court finds those holdings well-reasoned.	. See, e. 11, 2012 ounsel and Co., 2	e.g., MIC Philberts Invs. 2). In those cases, the and may be avoided or 2014 WL 2608209 at *3
	port an	award nearly ten times
minimum amount in controversy, or showing by a prepondera		· ·
ght of the foregoing, the action is hereby remanded to state co	ourt for	all further proceedings
S SO ORDERED.		
Initials of Prepar	er	:
	ROCIO MONARREZ v. WAL MART ASSOC., INC. ive. i	ROCIO MONARREZ v. WAL MART ASSOC., INC. ive. ive. citet courts within the Ninth Circuit are split with respect to including mount in controversy, and some courts have declined to do so. See, e. Co of Reading, Pa., 2012 WL 2118239 at *5 (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2012) found that attorneys' fees are in the control of the client and counsel as years, depending on legal strategy. See Grieff v. Brigandi Coin Co., 2 a. June 11, 2014). The Court finds those holdings well-reasoned and frees are too speculative for inclusion into amount in controversy. To punitive damages, Defendant has offered no evidence to support an ed back pay. Ordingly, the Court finds that Defendant has not satisfied its burden of minimum amount in controversy, or showing by a preponderance of introversy meets the jurisdictional requirement.